

Time-reversal asymmetry in Cont-Bouchaud stock market model

Iksoo Chang* and Dietrich Stauffer

Institute for Theoretical Physics, Cologne University, D-50923 Köln, Euroland

*Present and permanent address: Department of Physics, Pusan National University, Pusan 609-735, Korea; chang@random.phys.pusan.ac.kr

The percolation model of stock market speculation allows an asymmetry (in the return distribution) leading to fast downward crashes and slow upward recovery. We see more small upturns and more intermediate downturns.

Keywords: econophysics, speculation, return distribution

Many microscopic models of speculation in economic markets have been published since Stigler's first Monte Carlo simulation of 1964 [1]. Most of them give symmetric return distributions: The probability of gaining r percent is the same as the probability of a r percent loss, during the same time period. This symmetry is also roughly found in reality. However, in the crashes of 1929 and 1987 on Wall Street (as well as in March and April 2001), the fast crash was followed by a slower recovery [2], and a more sophisticated analysis of this lack of time-reveral invariance was published in [3]. We now try to put such an effect into the percolation model of Cont and Bouchaud [4] which was modified in many ways to give specific effects as observed in reality.

In the standard model, which we simulate here on triangular lattices, every lattice site is randomly either empty (in our case with probability $1/2$) or occupied by an agent (also with probability $1/2$). The resulting percolation clusters act as rigidly coupled sets of investors: They either all sell together with probability a , or buy with probability a , or are inactive with probability $1 - 2a$, during one time interval. The amount of trade is proportional to the number of agents in the cluster, and the relative price change r varies as the difference between supply and demand, summed over all active clusters. This model gave [4] a symmetric distribution of returns r with smooth maximum at $r = 0$ and a power-law tail for large returns, except for finite-size limitations of r and for a more Gaussian behaviour at large a . Modifications gave volatility clustering, outliers for very large r , and an asymmetry between sharp peaks and smooth valleys of price versus time. This asymmetry, however, is different from the one between past and future [4], on which we concentrate on now. We average over all times, while Lillo and Mantegna found asymmetries when separating crash periods from rally periods [5].

Instead of giving the same probability a to buy and sell, we assume that after a downward movement of the price agents have a higher probability to sell than to buy ("panic"), while after an upward movement the probability to buy is higher than that to sell. However, the panic effect is taken as ten times stronger than the influence of a price increase. In this case, prices show a downward trend apart from fluctuations, which gives an asymmetry trivially but is unrealistic. Therefore we also take into account a fundamentalist restoring force [6] like in the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process: High prices cause more people to sell than to buy, while low prices increase the buying probability.

Now after 10^3 time steps the prices settle down to a stationary plateau below the initial price, and we average only over the second half of the simulation.

The semilogarithmic plot of Fig.1 shows a maximum in the center, a power law for intermediate r , and an exponential decay for large r . More interesting are the same data in the center, plotted in Fig.2 on expanded scales. The maximum is now visibly shifted to the right: More price increases for small r . But for negative r a small bump is seen in the power-law regime: More price decreases at some intermediate r . (Since the overall prices are roughly constant, any increase of the probability for positive r must be matched by an increase also at some negative r .) It would be nice to see if high-precision data [7] of real markets, looked at more precisely as in Fig.2, will give similar effects as in our simulations based on 3.2×10^9 price changes.

We thank J.-F. Muzy, M. Ausloos, S. Solomon, D. Sornette and Y.-C. Zhang for helpful comments, DFG and KOSEF for supporting the visit of IC to Cologne, the Jülich Supercomputer Centre for time on their Cray-T3E, and the High Performance Supercomputing Centre of Pusan National University.

- [1] H. Levy, M. Levy and S. Solomon, *Microscopic Simulation of Financial Markets*, Academic Press, New York 2000.
- [2] D. Davis, and C. Holt, *Experimental Economics*, Princeton University Press, Princeton 1993 ; J. Kagel, J. and A. Roth, eds., *Handbook of Experimental Economics*, Princeton University Press, Princeton 1995. S. Solomon, priv. comm.; M. Ausloos, priv. comm., Y.C. Zhang, Physica A 269 (1999) 30.
- [3] A. Arneodo, J.F. Muzy and D. Sornette, Eur. Phys. J. B 2 (1998) 277; J.-F. Muzy, D. Sornette, J. Delour and A. Arneodo, Quantitative Finance 1 (2001) 131.
- [4] R. Cont and J.P. Bouchaud, eprint cond-mat/9712318 = Macroeconomic Dynamics 4 (2000) 170; D. Stauffer, Adv. Complex Syst. 4 (2001) No.1.
- [5] F. Lillo, R.N. Mantegna, Eur. Phys. J. B 15 (2000) 603; Phys. Rev. E 62 (2000) 6126.
- [6] I. Chang and D. Stauffer, Physica A 264 (1999) 294.
- [7] P. Gopikrishnan, V. Plerou, L.A.N. Amaral, M. Meyer, H.E. Stanley, Phys. Rev. E 60 (1999) 5305.

Captions:

Fig.1: Histogram of returns, in arbitrary units, for activity $a = 0.05$ averaged over nearly a million 301×301 critical percolation lattices, each followed over 5000 time steps, showing an overall symmetric behaviour. At the ends of the tails, consecutive bins were combined.
 Fig.2: This expanded central region of Fig.1 shows clearly the desired asymmetry between left (downturns) and right (upturns). The dashed line gives the standard model without panicky or fundamentalist agents.